arXiv:1703.05861v1 [math.CO] 17 Mar 2017

An Improved Bound for Upper Domination of Cartesian Products of Graphs

Yu-Yen Chien
Mathematics Division
National Center for Theoretical Science
Taiwan
yychien@ncts.ntu.edu.tw

March 20, 2017

Abstract

In this paper, we prove a problem proposed by Brešar: for any graphs G and H, $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq \Gamma(G)\Gamma(H)+\min\{|V(G)|-\Gamma(G), |V(H)|-\Gamma(H)\}$, where $\Gamma(G)$ denotes the upper domination number of G.

For a simple graph G, a subset D of $V(G)$ is a *dominating set* of G if every vertex in $V(G) \setminus D$ has at least one neighbor in D. The *domination number* $\gamma(G)$ is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of G. For graphs G and H, the *Cartesian product* $G\Box H$ is the graph with vertex set $V(G) \times V(H)$ and edge set $\{(u_1, v_1)(u_2, v_2)|u_1 = u_2, v_1v_2 \in E(H)$, or $v_1 = v_2, u_1u_2 \in E(G)\}$. Vizing [11] suggested a conjecture regarding domination in Cartesian products of graphs:

Vizing Conjecture. For any graphs G and H, $\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \gamma(G)\gamma(H)$.

This conjecture is one of the main problems in domination theory. See [3, 6, 8] for surveys and [1, 4, 10] for recent progress.

For a simple graph G, a dominating set D of G is a *minimal dominating set* if no proper subset of D is a dominating set of G. The *upper domination number* $\Gamma(G)$ of G is the maximum cardinality of a minimal dominating set of G. The definition of the domination number $\gamma(G)$ can be rephrased as the minimum cardinality of a minimal dominating set of G, and clearly we have $\Gamma(G) \geq \gamma(G)$ for any graph G. Nowakowski and Rall [9] conjectured that for any graphs G and H, $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq \Gamma(G)\Gamma(H)$. Brešar [2] proved a slightly

stronger bound: $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq \Gamma(G)\Gamma(H) + 1$ for any nontrivial graphs G and H, where a *nontrivial* graph is a graph with at least one edge. Brešar also proposed the following question: does the inequality

$$\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq \Gamma(G)\Gamma(H) + \min\{|V(G)| - \Gamma(G), |V(H)| - \Gamma(H)\}$$

hold for any graphs G and H? We prove this inequality in this paper.

We examine some basic properties about minimal dominating set first. G is a graph and D is a dominating set of G. We say a vertex in D is D-*isolated* if it is not adjacent to any other vertices in D. We say a vertex $v \in D$ has a *private* D-*neighbor* u if $u \notin D$ is a neighbor of v and is no neighbor of any other vertices in D. We have the following fundamental results.

Lemma 1.[7] A dominating set D of a graph G is a minimal dominating set if and only if every vertex in D is D-isolated or has a private D-neighbor.

Lemma 2. Given a dominating set D of a graph G, we can always find a subset D' of D such that D' is a minimal dominating set of G. Moreover, if $v \in D$ is D-isolated or has a private D-neighbor, then v must be in D'.

For the graph $G\Box H$, $u \in V(G)$, $v \in V(H)$, we call $\{u\} \times V(H)$ *row* u and $V(G) \times \{v\}$ *column* v. In the following, we consider upper domination in the Cartesian products of some basic graphs.

Proposition 3. For $m, n \geq 2$, $\Gamma(K_m\Box K_n) = \max\{m, n\}$.

Proof. Assume $n \geq m$. It is clear that a row of $K_m\Box K_n$ is a minimal dominating set, and $\Gamma(K_m\Box K_n) \geq n$. Suppose $K_m\Box K_n$ has a minimal dominating set D with cardinality greater than n. If every column of $K_m\Box K_n$ has a vertex in D, the $D = n$. Therefore, there exists a column without a vertex in D. To dominate vertices in this column, every row of $K_m\Box K_n$ must have a vertex in D. Then, we have $D = m$, a contradiction. □

The following proposition is implicitly proved by Gutin and Zverovich [5].

Proposition 4. For any graph G, $\Gamma(K_2\Box G) = |G|$.

Proof. We prove the case that G is connected and $|V(G)| \geq 2$, and then the general case follows. Since a row of $K_2\Box G$ is a minimal dominating set, we have $\Gamma(K_2\Box G) \geq |G|$. Suppose D is a minimal dominating set of $K_2\Box G$. For $v \in D$ having a private D-neighbor, assign one of its private D-neighbor as v'. For $v \in D$ having no private D-neighbor, assign the other vertex in column v as v'. For any $v \in D$, $v' \notin D$. For any different u, v in D, $u' \neq v'$. Therefore, $|D| \leq \frac{|K_2\Box G|}{2} = |G|$, and we have $\Gamma(K_2\Box G) = |G|$. □

Proposition 5. For $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2$, $\Gamma(K_m \Box K_{1,n}) = m + n - 2$.

Proof. Let $V(K_m) = \{u_1, ..., u_m\}$ and $V(K_{1,n}) = \{v_0, v_1, ..., v_n\}$, where v_0 is the vertex of degree n. $\{(u_i, v_1), (u_1, v_j) | m \geq i \geq 2, n \geq j \geq 2\}$ is a minimal dominating set of $K_m \Box K_{1,n}$, and we have $\Gamma(K_m \Box K_{1,n}) \geq m+n-2$. Suppose $K_m \Box K_{1,n}$ has a minimal dominating set D with $|D| > m+n-2$. If D has a vertex in each column of $K_m \Box K_{1,n}$, then $|D| = n+1 > m+n-2$, violating the assumption that $m \geq 3$. Therefore, there exists v_j such that column v_j contains no vertex in D. If $j \neq 0$, (u_i, v_0) must be in D to dominate (u_i, v_j), and we have $D = m > m + n - 2$, violating the assumption that $n \geq 2$. Therefore, column v_0 contains no vertex in D. To dominate (u_i, v_0), there exists some $(u_i, v_j) \in D$. Assign one of these vertices as $(u_i, v_0)'$. Let $D' = \{(u_i, v_0)' | m \geq i \geq 1\}$. Notice that D' can not be a column. Columns containing a vertex in D' do not contain any vertex in $D \setminus D'$. Except column v_0, columns containing no vertex in D' contains exact one vertex in $D \setminus D'$, and there are at most $n-2$ such columns. Therefore, $|D| \leq m + n - 2$, a contradiction. □

Proposition 6. For $l, m, n \geq 2$, we have

$$\Gamma(K_l \Box K_{m,n}) = \max\{m + n, 2l, m + l - 2, n + l - 2\}.$$

Proof. Suppose that $V(K_l) = \{u_1, ..., u_l\}$, and $K_{m,n}$ has partite sets $V = \{v_1, ..., v_m\}$ and $V' = \{v'_1, ..., v'_n\}$. Row u_1, union of column v_1 and column v'_1, $\{(u_i, v_1), (u_1, v_j) | l \geq i \geq 2, m \geq j \geq 2\}$, and $\{(u_i, v'_1), (u_1, v'_j) | l \geq i \geq 2, n \geq j \geq 2\}$ are minimal dominating sets of $K_l \Box K_{m,n}$, so we have $\Gamma(K_l \Box K_{m,n}) \geq \max\{m+n, 2l, m+l-2, n+l-2\}$. Suppose D is a minimal dominating set of $K_l \Box K_{m,n}$. If each column of $K_l \Box K_{m,n}$ has a vertex in D, then $|D| = m + n$. If each of $\{u_i\} \times V$ and $\{u_i\} \times V'$ has a vertex in D, then $|D| = 2l$. Suppose $|D| \geq \max\{m+n, 2l\}$, and then there exists a column v^* without vertex in D. If $v^* \in V'$, each of $\{u_i\} \times V$ must have a vertex w_i in D, and there exists some $\{u_i\} \times V'$ without vertex in D. Without loss of generality, suppose $\{u_1\} \times V'$ has no vertex in D and $w_1 = (u_1, v_1)$. To dominate (u_1, v_j) where column v_j has no vertex in $\{w_i\}$, column v_j must have a vertex $x_j \in D$. Notice that $\{w_i\} \cup \{x_j\}$ is a dominating set of $K_l \Box K_{m,n}$. If $\{w_i\}$ is a column, then $\{w_i\} \cup \{x_j\}$ can not be minimal. So $\{w_i\}$ is not a column, $|\{x_j\}| \leq m - 2$, and $|D| \leq m + l - 2$. If $v^* \in V$, similarly we have $|D| \leq n + l - 2$. □

We define two graphs X_n and X'_n here. X_n has vertex set $\{u_0, u_1, ..., u_n\} \cup \{v_0, v_1, ..., v_n\}$ and edge set $\{u_i u_j | i > j\} \cup \{v_i v_j | i > j\} \cup \{u_i v_i | i \neq 0\}$. We call the subgraph of X_n induced by $\{u_0, u_1, ..., u_n\}$ an *upper cell*, the subgraph induced by $\{v_0, v_1, ..., v_n\}$ a *lower cell*. We use X'_n to denote the subgraph induced by $\{u_1, ..., u_n\} \cup \{v_0, v_1, ..., v_n\}$ in X_n. Consider $\Gamma(X_n)$ and $\Gamma(X'_n)$.

For X_n, every cell of X_n must have a vertex to dominate u_0 and v_0, and these two vertices dominate X_n. Therefore, we have $\Gamma(X_n) = 2$. For X'_n, suppose D is a minimal dominating set of $\Gamma(X'_n)$. If each of $\{u_1, ..., u_n\}$ and $\{v_0, v_1..., v_n\}$ has a vertex in D, then $|D| = 2$. If $D > 2$, $\{v_0, v_1..., v_n\}$ must have a vertex in D to dominate v_0 and therefore $\{u_1, ..., u_n\}$ has no vertex in D. To dominate u_i, v_i must be in D. We have $D = \{v_1..., v_n\}$ and $\Gamma(X'_n) = n$. X'_n is the induced subgraph of X_n and $\Gamma(X'_n)$ is greater than $\Gamma(X_n)$. Similar situation also happens in Cartesian products of graphs. The following proposition gives an example.

Proposition 7. For sufficiently large n, we have $\Gamma(X'_n \Box K_3) > \Gamma(X_n \Box K_3)$.

Proof. Since $\{v_1, ..., v_n\} \times V(K_3)$ is a minimal dominating set of $X'_n \Box K_3$, we have $\Gamma(X'_n \Box K_3) \geq 3n$. Suppose D is a minimal dominating set of $X_n \times K_3$ with $|D| \geq 3n$. If a cell in $X_n \times K_3$ has two or more vertices in D, then these vertices must have private D-neighbors, which must be in cells without vertex in D. If n is sufficiently large, it is easy to see that there are three cells without vertex in D and almost all vertices in the other three cells are in D. Cells without vertex in D are not all upper cells, or $\{u_0\} \times V(K_3)$ can not be dominated. Similarly, cells without vertex in D are not all lower cells. Suppose two upper cells have no vertex in D. In the remaining upper cell, a vertex in D dominates at least two vertices in cells without vertex in D and prohibits these vertices from being private D-neighbors of other vertices in D. It follows that $|D| < 3n$, a contradiction. Therefore, we have $\Gamma(X'_n \Box K_3) \geq 3n > \Gamma(X_n \Box K_3)$. □

Suppose x is a vertex having only one neighbor y in a graph G. If D is a minimal dominating set of G, D must contain exactly one vertex of x and y. To minimize D, it is a better choice to put y in D. However, if we want to maximize D, putting x in D is not always better. For example, let G be the graph with vertex set $\{x, y\} \cup V(X_n)$ and edge set $\{xy, yu_0\} \cup E(X_n)$, and D is a minimal dominating set of G. Using similar argument in determining $\Gamma(X_n)$ and $\Gamma(X'_n)$, we know $|D| = 3$ if D contains x, and $|D| = n + 1$ if D contains y.

Given a graph G, if we add some edges in G to get a graph G', we always have $\gamma(G) \geq \gamma(G')$. However, upper domination in graphs does not have this property. For example, let G' be the graph obtained from adding edge u_0v_0 in $G = X_n$. Then G' is isomorphic to $K_2 \Box K_{n+1}$ and $\Gamma(G) = 2 < \Gamma(G') = n + 1$ for $n > 1$. The above examples show that upper domination in graphs probably does not behave as well as one may expect, and the argument of minimal counterexample probably does not work well in solving upper domination problems.

It is easy to see that a maximal independent set is a minimal dominating set, and therefore we have $\Gamma(G) \geq \alpha(G)$ for any graph G. It is clear that $\alpha(X_n) = \alpha(X'_n) = 2$. Since $\Gamma(X_n) = 2$ and $\Gamma(X'_n) = n$, we know the inequality $\Gamma(G) \geq \alpha(G)$ is sharp, and the difference between $\Gamma(G)$ and $\alpha(G)$ could be quite large.

Lemma 8. G and H are two arbitrary graphs. I_G and I_H are the maximal independent sets of G and H respectively. Let $G' = G[V(G) \setminus I_G]$ and $H' = G[V(H) \setminus I_H]$. We have $\Gamma(G \Box H) \geq |I_G||I_H| + \Gamma(G' \Box H')$.

Proof. Suppose $D_1 = I_G \times I_H$ and D_2 is the maximum minimal dominating set of $G' \Box H'$. We claim that $D_1 \cup D_2$ is a minimal dominating set of $G \Box H$ and then we have the inequality. Since I_G and I_H dominate $V(G)$ and $V(H)$ respectively, D_1 dominates $I(G) \times V(H)$ and $V(G) \times I(H)$, and $D_1 \cup D_2$ dominates $V(G) \times V(H)$. Notice that there is no edge between D_1 and D_2. Vertices in D_1 are $(D_1 \cup D_2)$-isolated, and D_2-isolated vertices are still $(D_1 \cup D_2)$-isolated. If a vertex u in D_2 has a private D_2-neighbor v in $G' \Box H'$, v is not adjacent to any vertex in D_1 and is still a private $(D_1 \cup D_2)$-neighbor of u in $G \Box H$. By Lemma 1, we know that $D_1 \cup D_2$ is a minimal dominating set of $G \Box H$. □

In $G \Box H$, we can choose vertices from different rows and columns to form an independent set. Therefore, we have $\Gamma(G \Box H) \geq \alpha(G \Box H) \geq \min\{|V(G)|, |V(H)|\}$. The following lemma improves this result.

Lemma 9. For any nontrivial graph G and arbitrary graph H, we have $\Gamma(G \Box H) \geq |V(H)|$, and the equality holds only if G is a complete graph or $K_{1,2}$.

Proof. Since G is nontrivial, we can always find a component G_0 of G with $|V(G_0)| \geq 2$. Choose a vertex u in $V(G_0)$. The set $N(u)$ of neighbors of u in G_0 is not empty. In case row u is a dominating set of $G_0 \Box H$, it is a minimal dominating set of $G_0 \Box H$ and we have $\Gamma(G \Box H) \geq \Gamma(G_0 \Box H) \geq |V(H)|$. Suppose row u is not a dominating set of $G_0 \Box H$. Let $D = (V(G_0) \setminus N(u)) \times V(H)$. Clearly, D is a dominating set of $G_0 \Box H$, and we can find a subset D' of D such that D' is a minimal dominating set of $G_0 \Box H$. For every vertex $v \in V(H)$, D' must have a vertex in column v of $G_0 \Box H$ to dominate vertices in $N(u) \times \{v\}$, and we have $\Gamma(G \Box H) \geq \Gamma(G_0 \Box H) \geq |V(H)|$.

Suppose $\Gamma(G \Box H) = |V(H)|$. G must be connected. Otherwise, we have $\Gamma(G \Box H) > \Gamma(G_0 \Box H) \geq |V(H)|$. If G is not bipartite, an induced subgraph of G from removing a maximal independent set of G is nontrivial. If G is bipartite but not complete bipartite, choose two vertices u and u' from

different partite sets of G such that u and u' are not adjacent. Suppose I is a maximal independent set of G containing u and u'. Then $G[V(G)\setminus I]$ must be nontrivial. Otherwise, G is not connected. Therefore, if G is not a complete bipartite graph, we can always find a maximal independent set I_G of G such that $G' = G[V(G) \setminus I_G]$ is nontrivial. Suppose I_H is a maximal independent set of H and $H' = H[V(H) \setminus I_H]$. By Lemma 8 and the inequality proven above, we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) = |V(H)| \geq |I_G||I_H| + \Gamma(G'\Box H') \geq |I_G||I_H| + |V(H')|$. It implies $|I_G| = 1$, which means G is a complete graph. Proposition 3 shows that the equality does hold while H is also a complete graph with $V(H) \geq V(G)$.

Consider the case that G is complete bipartite. If $G = K_{1,1}$, which is also a complete graph, Proposition 4 shows that the equality always holds. If $G = K_{1,2}$, Proposition 5 shows that the equality does hold while H is a complete graph with $V(H) \geq 3$.

If $G = K_{1,m}$, $m \geq 3$, let $V(G) = \{u_0, u_1, ..., u_m\}$, where u_0 is the vertex of degree m. If H has a vertex of degree 0, it is easy to see that $\Gamma(G\Box H) > |V(H)|$. Suppose every vertex of H has degree at least 1, and D_H is a minimal dominating set of H. Let $R_H = V(H) \setminus D_H$. Notice that R_H is not empty, and every vertex in D_H has a neighbor in R_H. In other words, R_H is a dominating set of H. By Lemma 1, it is easy to check that $(\{u_m\} \times R_H) \cup (\{u_1, ..., u_{m-1}\} \times D_H)$ is a minimal dominating set of $G\Box H$, and we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) > |V(H)|$. If $G = K_{m,n}$, $m, n \geq 2$, let u and u' be two vertices in different partite sets of G. Then $\{u, u'\} \times V(H)$ is a minimal dominating set of $G\Box H$, and we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) > |V(H)|$. □

Let D be the minimal dominating set of a graph G. We define D^P as the set of vertices in D having a private D-neighbor, and $D^I = D \setminus D^P$. By Lemma 1, we know vertices in D^I are D-isolated. Now we are ready to prove the main theorem.

Theorem 10. For any graphs G and H, we have

$$\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq \Gamma(G)\Gamma(H) + \min\{|V(G)| - \Gamma(G), |V(H)| - \Gamma(H)\}.$$

Proof. If G or H has no edge, then $|V(G)| = \Gamma(G)$ or $|V(H)| = \Gamma(H)$, and we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) = \Gamma(G)\Gamma(H) = \Gamma(G)\Gamma(H) + \min\{|V(G)| - \Gamma(G), |V(H)| - \Gamma(H)\}$. Now we prove the case that every vertex of G and H has degree at least 1, and then the case that G and H are nontrivial follows. Let D_G and D_H be the minimal dominating sets of G and H respectively. Define $R_G = V(G) \setminus D_G$, $R_H = V(H) \setminus D_H$, $G' = G[R_G]$, $H' = H[R_H]$. If D_G^P and D_H^P are both empty, then D_G and D_H are maximal independent sets of G and H respectively. By Lemma 8, we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |D_G||D_H| + \Gamma(G'\Box H') \geq |D_G||D_H| + \min\{|V(G)| - |D_G|, |V(H)| - |D_H|\}$.

Suppose D_G^P is not empty. For each vertex $(u,v) \in D_G^P \times D_H$, we select a corresponding vertex $(u,v)' = (u',v)$ such that u' is a private D_G-neighbor of u in G. Let $D_1 = \{(u,v)' | (u,v) \in D_G^P \times D_H\}$. For each vertex $(u,v) \in D_G^I \times D_H^P$, we select a corresponding vertex $(u,v)'' = (u,v'')$ such that v'' is a private D_H-neighbor of v in H. Let $D_2 = \{(u,v)'' | (u,v) \in D_G^I \times D_H^P\}$. Since every vertex of G has degree at least 1, every vertex in D_G^I must have a neighbor in R_G, and therefore R_G is a dominating set of G. Similarly, R_H is a dominating set of H. It is easy to check that $D = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup (D_G^I \times D_H^I) \cup (R_G \times R_H)$ is a dominating set of $G\Box H$. Let $D' \subset D$ be a minimal dominating set of $G\Box H$. Notice that each vertex in $D_G^I \times D_H^I$ is D-isolated, and each vertex in $D_1 \cup D_2$ has a private D-neighbor in $G\Box H$. By Lemma 2, we have $D_1 \cup D_2 \cup (D_G^I \times D_H^I) \subset D'$. There is no edge between $D_1 \cup D_2 \cup (D_G^I \times D_H^I)$ and $D_G^P \times R_H$. For each $v \in R_H$, D' must have at least one vertex in $R_G \times \{v\}$ to dominate vertices in $D_G^P \times \{v\}$. Therefore, we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |D'| \geq |D_1| + |D_2| + |D_G^I \times D_H^I| + |R_H| = |D_G||D_H| + |V(H)| - |D_H|$. It is easy to check that the above argument works no matter D_G^I, D_H^I, D_H^P are empty. □

In the above proof, if D_G^P and D_H^P are both empty, then we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |D_G||D_H| + \Gamma(G'\Box H')$. In case that G' and H' are nontrivial, such as G and H are not bipartite, then we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |D_G||D_H| + \max\{|V(G)| - |D_G|, |V(H)| - |D_H|\}$ by Lemma 9. If D_G^P is not empty, we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |D_G||D_H| + |V(H)| - |D_H|$. Therefore, if D_G^P and D_H^P are not empty, then we also have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |D_G||D_H| + \max\{|V(G)| - |D_G|, |V(H)| - |D_H|\}$. The above discussion shows that the inequality in Theorem 10 can be improved to $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq \Gamma(G)\Gamma(H) + \max\{|V(G)| - \Gamma(G), |V(H)| - \Gamma(H)\}$ in many cases. However, in general the minimum in the inequality can not be replaced by maximum. Let $G = K_6$ and $H = K_{4,8}$. We know $\Gamma(G) = 1$, $\Gamma(H) = 8$, and $\Gamma(G\Box H) = 12$ by Proposition 6. It shows that the inequality in Theorem 10 is sharp. We wonder if the lower bound of $\Gamma(G\Box H)$ is close to $\Gamma(G)\Gamma(H) + \max\{|V(G)| - \Gamma(G), |V(H)| - \Gamma(H)\}$. For example, for $G = K_l$ and $H = K_{m,n}$, $l, m, n \geq 2$, we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq \Gamma(G)\Gamma(H) + \max\{|V(G)| - \Gamma(G), |V(H)| - \Gamma(H)\} - 1$ by Proposition 6.

We give an alternative lower bound of $\Gamma(G\Box H)$ to end this paper. This lower bound can be much better than Theorem 10 in some cases. For a graph G and $S \subset V(G)$, we define $N[S] = S \cup \{v \in V(G) | v \text{ has a neighbor in } S\}$.

Theorem 11. *G and H are two arbitrary graphs, and D is a minimal dominating set of H. We have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |V(G)||D^P| + \gamma(G)|D^I|$. Moreover, if $N[D^P] \cup D^I = V(H)$, then we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |V(G)||D^P| + \Gamma(G)|D^I|$.*

Proof. Let $D_1 = V(G) \times D^P$ and $D_2 = V(G) \times D^I$. Clearly, $D_1 \cup D_2$

is a dominating set of $G\Box H$, and suppose $D_3 \subset D_1 \cup D_2$ is a minimal dominating set of $G\Box H$. Notice that vertices in D_1 have private $(D_1 \cup D_2)$-neighbors in $G\Box H$, and therefore $D_1 \subset D_3$. For $v \in D^I$, D_3 must have at least $\gamma(G)$ vertices in column v to dominate column v. Therefore, $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |D_3| \geq |V(G)||D^P| + \gamma(G)|D^I|$. In case $N[D^P] \cup D^I = V(H)$, let D' be a maximum minimal dominating set of $V(G)$. It is easy to check that $D_1 \cup (D' \times D^I)$ is a minimal dominating set of $G\Box H$, and we have $\Gamma(G\Box H) \geq |V(G)||D^P| + \Gamma(G)|D^I|$. □

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank the support of National Center for Theoretical Science, Taiwan.

References

[1] R. Aharoni and T. Szabó, Vizings conjecture for chordal graphs, Discrete Math 309(6) (2009), 1766-1768.

[2] B. Brešar, Vizing-like conjecture for the upper domination of Cartesian products of graphs - the proof, Electron. J. Combin. 12 (2005), #N12.

[3] B. Brešar, P. Dorbec, W. Goddard, B. L. Hartnell, M. A. Henning, S. Klavžar, and D. F. Rall, Vizings conjecture: a survey and recent results, J. Graph Theory 69 (2012) 46-76.

[4] W. E. Clark and S. Suen, An inequality related to Vizing's conjecture, Electron. J. Combin. 7 (2000), #N4.

[5] G. Gutin and V. E. Zverovich, Upper domination and upper irredundane perfect graphs, Discrete Math. 190 (1998), 95-105.

[6] B. Hartnell and D. F. Rall, Domination in Cartesian products: Vizing's conjecture (In: T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater (eds), Domination in Graphs, Advanced Topics, Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, 1998), 163-189.

[7] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater (eds), Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs, Marcel Dekker, Inc. New York, 1998.

[8] W. Imrich and S. Klavžar, Product Graphs: Structure and Recognition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2000.

[9] R. J. Nowakowski and D.F. Rall, Associative graph products and their independence, domination and coloring numbers, Dicuss. Math. Graph Theory 16 (1996), 53-79.

[10] L. Sun, A result on Vizing's conjecture, Discrete Math. 275 (2004), 363-366.

[11] V. G. Vizing, Some unsolved problems in graph theory, Uspehi Mat. Nauk 23 (1968) no. 6 (144), 117-134.